

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

FRANCIS AKINRO

Plaintiff,

v.

CAPITAL ONE BANK, et al.

Defendants.

*

*

CIVIL ACTION NO. RDB-10-1387

*

MEMORANDUM

Plaintiff, a resident of Baltimore, Maryland who holds himself out as a “Professor,” “Assistant Attorney General” for the State of Maryland,” “U.S. Solicitor General” and Department of Justice employee, filed this 28 U.S.C. § 1332 action on May 27, 2010, against Capital One Bank and others. His statement of facts alleges that:

“Defendant Capital One hired Mr. Joseph Taye Badejo and his group to blockage my credit card so that I cannot use it. The group are preparing my statement like the owner of the credit card. I cannot dispute unauthorized changes which amounted to thousands of dollars. The Court should rule on Defendant and order them to remove the blockage from my credit card. The Court should also punish Mr. Joseph Taye Badejo and his group to life in prison and the death penalty for their action to kill me because of the credit card.”

Paper No. 1 at 2.

In his relief request, Plaintiff seeks the award of \$497,000,000,000.00 and court order to activate his credit card and to impose life imprisonment and the death penalty on Defendants.¹ Although Plaintiff’s indigency application contains information the court finds questionable, he shall be granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*.²


¹ Accompanying the Complaint is an Addendum which cites to Illinois law and federal criminal and consumer statute. Also attached is an arrest warrant for approximately 80 individuals from Maryland, Texas, California, and Nigeria, including government officials from Maryland and California and a Maryland federal court judge. Paper No.1 at Attachments.

² Plaintiff claims that he receives \$3,063.00 in monthly retirement income; has been employed

This Court may preliminarily review the Complaint allegations before service of process and dismiss them *sua sponte* if satisfied that the Complaint has no factual or legal basis. See *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989); see also *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992); *Cochran v. Morris*, 73 F.3d 1310, 1314 (4th Cir. 1996); *Nasim v. Warden*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995). As explained by the Supreme Court in *Neitzke*: "Examples of [factually baseless lawsuits] are claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios, with which federal district judges are all too familiar." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. at 328.

Even when affording the *pro se* Complaint and accompanying materials a generous construction, the Court finds no basis to allow the action to go forward or to require supplementation. The Complaint allegations speak for themselves and the matter shall be summarily dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). A separate Order follows.

Date: June 7, 2010



RICHARD D. BENNETT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

by the U.S. Department of Justice since July of 2009; and has \$200,000.00 accumulated at four separate banks.
Paper No. 2.